



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

lie—a treason. *Traduttore traditore*. In every city whither artists should be sent to copy any master-piece, it would be proper to form a jury of examination, composed of a sufficient number of persons to secure an impartial decision. This jury would affix its true value to every copy submitted to them with the more exactness, from the fact that they could place copy and original side by side. Perhaps it would be well to apply to this estimate a combination similar to that of De Piles's *Balance of Painters*, expressing, by figures, from zero to 10, for instance, the degrees of exactness and approximation to the model. These figures would serve to class different copies of the same picture made at different epochs.

* * * * *

Would that we might see united at the Louvre copies of the master-pieces we have had the privilege of admiring at different times in Italy and Germany! Would that we might thus find the *Titans* of Giulio Romano (from the Palace of T at Mantua), at a few steps distant from the *Damned* of Rubens, (from the Pinakothek of Munich)! that we might turn from the *Prophets* of Michael Angelo, to the *Evangelists* of Albert Durer (Munich), and of Fra Bartholomeo (Pitti Palace)! that we might contemplate alternately the head of *Joconde* at the Louvre, by Leonardo da Vinci, and his figures of *Modesty* and *Vanity*, from the Sciarra Palace (Rome), the *Madonna della Seggiola* and the *Belle Jardiniere* of Raphael! that we might compare with each other the ascetic pictures of Fra Angelico and Hemling—study in curious proximity the *Last Supper* of Leonardo da Vinci (Milan), that attributed to Raphael, and recently discovered at Florence, and that of Ghirlandajo, from the refectory of the Dominicans of the same city! There is nobody, having a taste for the arts, who does not feel all the value and charm of such comparative studies. We are fully persuaded ourselves of the utility that would be added to our Museum if it should be completed by means of exact copies, so as to facilitate these interesting and productive studies. We have a lively desire that the project here advanced of having a MUSEUM OF COPIES should be taken into consideration by the Administration, or examined and fortified by a voice more authoritative than ours, in order to insure its success.

CORRESPONDENCE OF THE BULLETIN.

RUSKIN AND THE PRE-RAFFAELITES.

To the Editor of the *Art-Union Bulletin*.

DEAR SIR:—Having introduced into your columns the discussion now going on between Ruskin and the London critics, with regard to the P. R. B. you will doubtless be pleased to give place to a vindication of him from the charge of *inconsistency* laid upon him, with as much zeal, as stupidity by his opponents. It is a matter well known, probably, to your readers, that between Ruskin and that portion of the critical profession which is represented by the writers for the *Times*, *Athenæum*, &c., there is open hostility, or at least such hostility as can exist between a great man strong in the truth, and conscious of his strength; and the snarling cynics who neglect no occasion to pit themselves against him. That they should dislike and oppose him is very reasonable, for could he per-

sue the English public of so absurd a thing as that any study, farther than going the rounds of the National and Dulwich galleries, is necessary to fit one to be a guide of public taste, a dispenser of the awards of merit to struggling talent, "Othello's occupation's gone." That their absurd fulminations disturb him, few will believe who know his earnest spirit and how much of the best talent of England is gathered around him, holding like faith and hope.

Ruskin's position with regard to the P. R. B. has called out anew the bitterest hostility, and derision of his enemies. Some little explanation may assist a portion of your readers to a better understanding of the matter in dispute. The P. R. B. or Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood is an association of young artists, so calling themselves on account of a belief they entertain, that in order to attain to the dignity and grace of Raffaele and his successors, it is necessary to go back to the same discipline and course of study which Raffaele pursued, and received from the early religious painters of Italy. These views are identical with, and probably derived from, the purist school of Germany, and first introduced into England by Herbert. In accordance with their persuasion, they threw aside the more sensual characteristics of art, and devoted themselves to the most earnest study of the smallest details of their pictures, rightly judging that to attain perfection of the whole they must begin at perfection of the parts. The result was a hardness and dryness, a lineal quality in their pictures, and an absence of executive vigor, which was of course little liked by the English public. Criticism was harsh, and it is likely that a band of young, enthusiastic, artists, suffering, as they thought, a kind of persecution on account of a principle, should become ultra in their views and tendencies on account of that persecution. According to the workings of human nature in such cases, they rather cultivated than discouraged that dryness in their works, in bravado to a judgment which they felt to be unjust. Their pictures are noted for a remarkable faithfulness of portraiture in the accessories, and it was for this characteristic that Ruskin praised them, and for which approbation he is so attacked by his critics.

But let us see why Mr. Ruskin makes this a subject of praise, and then examine the charge of the inconsistency of this with his former views. They who have studied Ruskin's works, will know how great a value he places on the element of love in art as compared to power, and will understand that it is the display of that quality which especially merited his, as well as all earnest men's commendation, as well as the determined rejection of all conventionalisms by the P. R. B. It is this earnest love of even the trifles so called of their work, that gives him hope of their attaining to great results; judging that minds thus prepared in their elementary studies, will be better fitted for the advance to the higher, than those who have sought velocity without decision, and facility without aim, through their early study. It is not so much their achievements as their promise—their works as the temper in which they wrought—of which he has declared his approval. It is that, lovingly and affectionately, they have set to work at those things which less earnest men have despised and neglected, in the hope that as their power and experience increase, they

may attain to that same fidelity of representation of things, nobler, and even better worth their thought. Is there anything inconsistent or foolish in such a hope? If there be, Ruskin is not alone in it. One of the deepest minded artists in England declared to the writer his opinion, that if English historical art ever attained to greatness, it would be through that very school.

And now, as to the charge of inconsistency. Let us collate some passages from his works and examine their tendency. "The higher the mind, it may be taken as a universal rule, the less it will scorn that which appears to be small and unimportant; and the rank of a painter may always be determined by observing how he uses, and with what respect he views, the minutiae of nature. Greatness of mind is not shown by admitting small things, but by making small things great under its influence. He who can take no interest in what is small will take no interest in what is great; he who cannot make a bank sublime will make a mountain ridiculous." *Mod. Painters*, Vol. I, P. 2, Ch. IV. §28. Farther, in speaking of the great masters of art he instances the greatest examples in favor of the very course to which the P. R. B. are tending. "The great masters of Italy, almost without an exception, and Titian perhaps more than any (for he had the highest knowledge of landscape), are in the constant habit of rendering every detail of their foregrounds with the most laborious botanical fidelity: witness the "Bacchus and Ariadne," in which the foreground is occupied by the common blue iris, the aquilegia, and the wild rose; every stamen of which latter is given while the blossoms and leaves of the columbine (a difficult flower to draw) have been studied with the most exquisite accuracy. The foregrounds of Raffaele's two cartoons—"The Miraculous Draught of Fishes" and "The Charge to Peter"—are covered with plants of the common sea colewort (*crambe maritima*), of which the sinuated leaves and clustered blossoms would have exhausted the patience of any other artist, but have appeared worthy of prolonged and thoughtful labor to the great mind of Raffaele." *Pref. to Ind. Ed.* p. 28. Another passage from the same preface bears more directly on the point in question. After alluding to the manner in which the powerful artist treats details, he observes: "Thus, frequently to the latest period of his life, like Sir Joshua, he separates, as chief enemies, the details and the whole, which an artist cannot be great unless he reconciles; and because details alone, and unreferred to a final purpose, are the sign of a tyro's work, he loses sight of the remoter truth that details perfect in unity, and contributing to a final purpose, are the sign of the production of a consummate master.

"It is not therefore detail sought for its own sake—not the calculable bricks of the Dutch house-painters—not the numbered hairs and mapped wrinkles of Denner—which constitute great art—they are the lowest and most contemptible art; but it is detail referred to a great end—sought for the sake of the inestimable beauty which exists in the slightest and least of God's works, and treated in a manly, broad, and impressive manner."

This is the treatment resultant from the feeling of the P. R. B., and, though it may be that there is much affectation among them—some weak men who are led by their vanity and de-

sire of notoriety to commit extravagancies it does not follow that the feeling where it does exist pure is less noble. If their present power does not permit their attaining the desirable truth and consequent beauty in the more important parts of their pictures, does that constitute a reason why they should not attain it in the draperies and accessories? It is true that their pictures are awkward and stiff, but have they not thought? There were few pictures in the exhibition of the Royal Academy in 1850, that contained more of that essential than Millais' *Christ in the Carpenter's shop*. Thus again Ruskin: "The picture which has the nobler and more numerous ideas, however awkwardly expressed, is a greater and better picture than that which has the less noble and less numerous ideas, however beautifully expressed." P. 1, Sc. 1, ch. 11 § 7 M. Painters.

Is there anything like inconsistency in all this? But the critic of the *Times*, with the impudence of misrepresentation worthy of his journal and characteristic of it, quotes the doctrine which Ruskin advances, to prove the truth of Turner's distances, where generalization is necessary and detail impossible, to prove the falsehood of the detail in figure compositions! Where are the mind and taste of England while falsehood and ignorance thus employ the mighty power of its leading journal to mislead the feeling and blind the perception of the public.

In conclusion, let us hope that the artists of America will weigh even this controversy, and truly estimate the importance of this earnest, faithful study. If we ever possess a national school, it must be raised by home study of that passionate kind which shall make every thing it touches truly national. Our landscape painters have set a noble example, and there are bits of foreground study by DURAND, CROPSEY, KENSETT, and CHURCH, which are unsurpassed by any school. A study of an old boat by CHURCH, in the last exhibition of the Academy, was a perfect marvel of fidelity, and if he would make twenty such studies instead of one, every summer, we should soon hear a worthy report from him. There were some studies of planets, &c., in the foreground of CROPSEY's *Eagle Cliff*, most perfect in their way, and I believe that DURAND's rendering of the broken and mingled turf and earth of the brookside banks to be unequalled in perfect realization by anything the world can show. Our artists do not need to go from home to study. Let them go and see what has been done, and then return to cultivate originality where their lot is cast. If we are to rear an Art-Temple in America, it must be from the living stone of our own mountains—not the crumbling, ruinous fragments of the Old World's falling shrines. It is of no use to say that we have no facility for study, no academies, no models; the less we have of academies the better, the more we shall have of nature; and as to models, I doubt if ever one of our artists succeeded in rendering half the beauty of the poorest of the Academy models. DARLEY has produced beautiful figures from American models—quite as good as are produced by any but very few of the English school. He is no genius who cannot work through greater obstacles than these to greatness. I believe that the practice of so many of our young artists in running off to Europe to study, and spending, in desultory and fitful application, or in dissipation too often,

the years that ought to be devoted to the study of home material and the development of a home feeling, is as destructive to individual as it is to national greatness. To any one conversant with the history of our art I need not instance examples of the effect of foreign schools on it. But I have made my communication longer than I intended, though not so long as the importance of the subject would justify, and I will close with a quotation from Ruskin, which I would earnestly commend to the deepest consideration of our artists, only changing the terms of nationality. "If a British painter, I say this in earnest seriousness, cannot make historical characters out of the British House of Peers, he cannot paint history; and if he cannot make a Madonna of a British girl of the nineteenth century, he cannot paint one at all." W.

A BIOGRAPHICAL, TECHNOLOGICAL, AND TOPICAL DICTIONARY OF ART.

[Continued.]

[It is intended to include in this Dictionary, which will be continued from time to time in the Bulletin, biographical notices of artists, ancient and modern, living and dead, native and foreign; as well as explanations of technical terms, and other matters of interest to the student of art.]

ANGELS, in Christian Art, are very frequently represented both in sculpture and in painting. By the devout artists of the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries, angels are depicted of human form, and masculine; as young, to show their continued strength; winged,* as messengers of grace and good tidings, and to show their unweariedness; barefooted and girt to show their readiness, and that they did not belong to this earth; they were clothed in robes of white, to show their purity, or in cloth of gold to show their sanctity and glory; the cloth of gold diapered with orphreys of jewels and precious stones; with emerald (*unfading youth*); crystal (*purity*); sapphire (*celestial contemplation*); and ruby (*divine love*). At this period of the history of Art, angels were often represented as clothed in the ecclesiastical vestments, copes, chasubles, dalmatics, and tunicles, but in the works of an earlier period they are usually figured in albes, white with golden wings.† Sometimes angels were drawn as feathered all over like birds, as is frequently seen in the carving and stained glass of the fifteenth century, but the idea is not warranted by the tradition of Christian antiquity, and the effect, bordering on the ludicrous, is far from good. In Christian design, in sculpture, and in painting, angels are frequently introduced, as corbels, bearing the stanchions of roofs; as bosses, or in pannels and spandrels, bearing labels with scriptures, or emblems of sacred things, or shields of arms; on shafts and beams; holding candlesticks; as supporting the head of a monumental effigy; in adoration round the sacred symbols, or persons winged with the hands extended, and standing on wheels. Of good Angels there are nine degrees, which are divided into three categories. The first consists of CHERUBIMS, SERAPHIMS, and THRONES; the second of DOMINIONS, POWERS, and PRINCIPALITIES; the third of ANGELS, ARCHANGELS, and VIRTUES. Their attributes are—1. Trumpets (*the voice of God*). 2. Flaming swords (*the wrath of God*). 3. Sceptres (*the power of God*). 4. Thuribles or censers, incense (*the prayers of saints they offer*). 5. Musical instruments, such as harps, trumpets, and organs, to express their *felicity*. The nine orders of an-

* ANGEL is the name, not of an order of beings, but of an office, and means messenger, therefore they are represented with wings.

† "On the revival of Pagan design in the sixteenth century, the edifying and traditional representations of angelic spirits, were abandoned, and in lieu of the albe of purity and golden vests of glory, the artists indulged in pretty cupids sporting in clouds, or half-naked youths twisting like posture-masters, to display their limbs without repose, dignity, or even decency of apparel."—PUGNIN'S *Glossary of Ecclesiastical Ornament*.

gels are frequently introduced in the magnificent rose-windows of the Continental churches, diverging from the centre in nine circumferences of rich tracery.

ANGERSTEIN COLLECTION.—This collection of pictures, 38 in number, was bought by the British Parliament at the suggestion of Sir George Beaumont, in 1823, of the heirs of John Julius Angerstein, for the price of £57,000, to form the nucleus of a National Gallery.

ANGIOLO (Michael di Campidoglio), a painter of fruit, flowers, and still life, born at Rome in 1610, and died in 1670, aged 60. He derived his appellation of Campidoglio from a situation he held in the capitol at Rome; and was a disciple of Fioravante. He had an admirable style for the subjects he chose, which he designed and finished superior to any artist of his time. The pictures by this master now remaining have much force and relief.

ANGUIER (Francis), a celebrated French sculptor, born at Eu in Normandy, about 1605. He was made keeper of the royal cabinet of antiquities, and executed several great works, particularly the tomb of James Souvre, in the church of Giovanni Laterano, and the mausoleum of the Duke de Montmorency.

ANGUIER (Michael), brother of the above, and of the same profession. He is reckoned a sculptor of great abilities, and executed greater works than Francis. His last piece was a crucifix over the altar of the church of the Sorbonne at Paris.

ANGUSCIOLA (Sophonisba), better known by the name of Sophonisba, an Italian paintress of great eminence, both in portrait and in history, born at Cremona in 1533, and died in 1626, aged 93. Sophonisba was of a very distinguished family, and was first under the tuition of Bernardino Campo Cremona, and afterwards learned perspective and coloring from Bernardo Gatti, called Solaro. Her principal works are portraits, which engrossed the greatest part of her time, yet she executed several historical subjects with great spirit; the attitudes of her figures are easy, natural and graceful. She became blind through over application to her profession, but she enjoyed the friendship of the greatest characters of the day. Vandyck, it is said, acknowledged himself to have more benefited by her than all his other studies. Among some of the principal works of this artist are the marriage of St. Catherine, now in the Pembroke collection at Wilton; a portrait of herself playing on the harpsichord, and an old female attendant in waiting.

ANGUSCIOLA (Lucia), sister to the foregoing, and a paintress of considerable skill: she obtained by her portraits a reputation not inferior to Sophonisba, as well for truth and delicacy of coloring, as correctness of resemblance, and easiness of attitude.

ANICHINI (Lewiss), a gem sculptor and medalist. His most celebrated work is a medal which he designed for Pope Paul III., on which was represented the interview between Alexander the Great and the High Priest, at Jerusalem, so exquisitely finished, that Michael Angelo, on viewing it, exclaimed, "Anichini had carried the art to the height of perfection."

ANIMAL PAINTING. Some artists have so excelled in the representations of animals, that their pictures form a distinct class. These are usually of large dimensions, and the subjects are principally those of the chase; thus, we have Boar-hunts, Lion-hunts, Deer-hunts, usually painted with the view of adorning hunting-seats, baronial halls, &c. The animals are exhibited in all the wild energies of life, or dead, as trophies. The greatest masters in this class of painting are the friend of Rubens, F. Snijders, J. Weenix, M. Hindekoeter, C. Rutharts, P. Caulitz, J. E. Ridinger, and Lilienberg. Another set of painters who have delighted to depict animals as they appear in the shambles or the kitchen, are, in fact, *meat-painters*; surrounded with the utensils of the kitchen and other consonant paraphernalia, they exhibit great pains-taking in their execution, but their